

Edit	resolution	edited by
<p>p.17: need example species for monolactic.</p> <p>Also, at bottom of page, question regarding the term diapause versus hibernation.</p>	<p>Example of “monolactic” with reference and citation provided by Mace</p> <p>On the hibernation issue, it is likely that bumble bee queens are most aptly described as entering diapause rather than hibernation, since bumble bees don’t grow during this “overwintering” process; however, I don’t believe it is critical that the technical term is used</p>	TM/TMS
<p>p. 41: change by GL to the references for OECD tiered testing process... we need to have this reviewed to make sure that references are correct.</p>	<p>The changes appear to be accurate.</p>	TMS
<p>p. 68: need a citation for Tapparo et al.</p>	<p>Added reference; however, the research was published subsequent to the Pellston. ... Is this ok???</p>	TMS
<p>p. 72: we need to re-do Figure 7-1 to make it nicer/clearer</p>	<p>I put in a “fix”.</p> <p>... Tom improved it, but I think we should produce something that is a bit more professional</p>	TMS
<p>p. 96: MB asked for a citation for comment about healthy colonies receiving greater exposure.</p>	<p>Sentence could be rephrased so as not to need a reference.</p>	TMS
<p>p. 97: scientific names for several plants are referenced in a cited study... we should either see the article or just get the scientific names from a generic source and include them.</p>	<p>Scientific names added.</p>	TMS
<p>p. 114: need a reference and citation for Krupke or other dust study ... Tapparo ?</p>	<p>Krupke and Tapparo were published in 2012; more appropriate references from 2009</p>	TMS

	added; reference section must be sorted alphabetically.	
p. 121: reviewer (GL) made a comment that one of the guidelines that this chapter cited (OECD 75 (2007)) was not an acute test but a semi-field test. I would like to make sure that the other guidelines cited are indeed, acute test guidelines.	The references cited in the highlighted sections appear to be correct. The actual acute oral and contact toxicity studies are OECD 1998a and 1998b; however, EPPO 170 discusses the tests as well.	TMS
p. 124: GL noted that “rather than testing both approaches until sufficient data is available, it would be better to conduct preliminary testing to decide on which is the best approach to use before implementation – otherwise it is not clear what the information generated means.” I thought the comment made sense, let me know if it makes sense to you as well. If you agree that the comment does make sense, we can (i) turn it into a “for further research” point and (ii) modify the sentence here on p. 124 a bit to reflect this.	I edited the section to read that research is continuing to determine which approach is most appropriate. Typically though, acute testing involves a single exposure while chronic involves multiple exposures.	TMS
p. 125: GL employed the term “susceptibility” with respect to the different routes of exposure that a non-Apis will get verses an Apis. I want to make sure that this term is good to use in this context.	The term susceptibility implies an exposure component; it’s a reasonable edit.	TMS
p. 126: Figures 8-1, 8-2 and 8-3 of comparative toxicity need work: (i) a diagonal line; (ii) names in the table.		Sent to J. Frazier for resolution ... he sent on to Scott-Dupree
p. 135: MB noted that the sentence needs a reference since it says that “Studies have shown...”	Sent to Jim for input	tm

p. 141 References for Chapter 8 need to be alphabetized	Completed	TM
p. 145 + and p. 154: GL noted that “it is important not to confuse a toxic standard (validation of a test) and a toxic reference (comparison of test material with known effects).” ... The text must be clear about this distinction and we need to make sure that this chapter uses the term(s) appropriately. Can this chapter be reviewed very briefly to ensure that the correct term is used. I highlighted the first box of Table 9-1 because this is the first place where GL identified these terms.... And because this box uses two terms, “toxic standard” and “reference chemical”	I have tried to find terminology related to “standard” and replaced with “reference toxicant”.	TMS
p. 151: The way the highlighted sentence is written, it suggests that a bumble bee colony raises no queens and eventually dies out. MB asks “at some point doesn’t the nest develop queens?” Can we change this sentence to be more technically correct include that Bb nests do raise queens and continue to survive?	Sent to M.Vaughan for editorial input  Change byt M.Vaughan suggested: to add “and queens” and strike the last phrase ( ...”and the colony will dwindle”)	MV
p. 163 and 164: Two sentences indicate some contradiction (or are not entirely consistent) ... what is the average max of a bumble bee colony - 300 ?... we can then fix the two sentences to make sure they are consistent?	Made a quick fix to the second sentence.	TMS
p. 170: We need a reference for Uruca ... which appears to be a reference about rearing and managing <i>Melipona scutellaris</i> .	Specific reference to Uruca has been deleted. A sentence was inserted to direct readers to Table 3-1	

<p>p. 172: MB points out that Tables 9-1 and 9-2 are not the same construction as 9-4. In the former, the strengths and weaknesses of Apis and non-Apis are broken out in separate tables, with respect to semi-field studies. For field studies, the strengths and weaknesses of Apis and non-Apis are combined into one table (i.e., 9-4). I looked at the tables and do not see a way of taking 9-4 and turning it into two tables (one for strengths/weaknesses for Apis for field studies, and another table for strengths/weakness for non-Apis for field studies). I suggest we leave it as is.</p>	<p>It's fine.</p>	<p>TMS</p>
<p>p. 187: This sentence is highlighted to bring our attention to the issue of efforts related to the stats. We need to be clear that Bill will do something, and make sure we are ok with the way Chap. 12 is written.</p>		
<p>p. 196: Table 10-1 - GL suggested that (under Assessment Endpoints) that "persistence" on the crop/in the boundaries ... be replaced with "activity" ... I like the suggestion but this table has been reproduced (EPA White Paper) with the word "persistence" ... what do we think of changing this word at this point?</p>	<p>The table describes assessment and measurement endpoints for bees. The word activity has been replaced with stability, <i>i.e.</i>, population size and stability.</p>	<p>TMS</p>
<p>Changes to opening of Chap. 10: + took Table 10-2 (risk assessment terminology) and moved it up behind 10-1 (protection goals/assessment endpoints) and changed the title of this section to include "risk assessment terminology". + moved the section entitled "Screening-Level Risk Assessments</p>	<p>Table caption should be at the top of the table. The automated numbering needs to be fixed.</p> <p>Table numbering and page numbering look ok - TM</p>	<p>TMS (see note)</p>

(Tier 1)” to just after the flow charts, and in front of the section entitled “Factors limiting certainty in the screening step”		
p. 214: GL asks why is there a reference to parasitoid and Typhlodromus here?	Changes/edits by Anne have been incorporated	Question sent to Anne Alix
p. 220 (and other pages): MB made some corrections in this chapter and in Chap 9, (and in perhaps in Chap 4) to two particular names. ... “Meliponini” and “Meliponinae” /// and /// “Bombini” and “Bombinae” ... I think we need to search the document for these words and make sure that the correct spelling/word is being used for the species or family respectively.	I am a little confused by this. Meliponini and Bombini both belong to the family Apidae. I presume this issue is related to the use of the genus name with reference to species within the genus. I have gone through to make sure the text associated with these genera are consistent.	TMS
p. 234: Need to check this citation, the word “Say” in the title seems like a typo	It is correct as is; Say is the person who described the species.	TMS
p. 244: “IBMs” needs to be spelled out	Done	Sent to V.Grimm for response
p. 246: “CREAM” needs to be spelled out	Done: Chemical Risk Effects Assessment Model  Other minor edits in this chapter were provided by Volker and have been incorporated	TMS/TM
p. 253: reference to the model “beehave” and its availability in 2012.... Is this model now available? If so, or not we need to change the text to be current and accurate.	Comments by Volker, including this one, have been incorporated	TM
p. 261: We need clarification with the Warren-Hick effort and this needs to be clear in this chapter.		

p. 266: need to define “eco-epidemiological analysis”	It seems intuitively obvious that these are multivariate analyses similar to epi studies. However, I have put in a reference.	TMS
p. 283: Reference to JORF 2010 must have an appropriate reference.	Sentence was restructured to avoid the need for a specific reference.	TM